

### **REMARKS**

This is a full and timely response to the Office Action mailed January 16, 2008.

By this Amendment, claims 1 and 2 have been amended to more particularly define the present invention. Further, new claim 9 has been added to further define a feature of the present invention. Thus, claims 1-9 are currently pending in this application. Support for the claim amendments can be readily found variously throughout the specification and the original claims, see, in particular, page 9, lines 14-25, and the Examples of the specification (especially Table 1 on page 18).

In view of these amendments, Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1, 2 and 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kimura et al. (WO 98/15600 using U.S. Patent No. 6,407,033 as English translation) (hereinafter “Kimura”). Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kimura as evidence by Koyanagi (U.S. Patent No. 7,192,986). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the cited reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest the invention as a whole, including all the limitations of the claims. Here, in this case, none of the cited references teach or suggest the claim limitations “*wherein a content of said Zr containing organic compound in terms of an oxide thereof is 0.005 to 0.1 parts by weight with respect to 1 part by weight of TiO<sub>2</sub>, a content of said Si containing compound in terms of an oxide thereof is 0.5 to 6.0 parts by weight with respect to 1 part by weight of TiO<sub>2</sub>, and a content of said SiO<sub>2</sub> particles is 0.1 to 3 parts by weight with respect to 1 part by weight in terms of an oxide of said hydrolyzable silicone resin*”.

In the silicone resin composition of the present invention, the Zr containing organic compound such as Zr(OC<sub>4</sub>H<sub>9</sub>)<sub>3</sub>(C<sub>5</sub>H<sub>7</sub>O<sub>2</sub>) and Zr(OC<sub>4</sub>H<sub>9</sub>)(C<sub>5</sub>H<sub>7</sub>O<sub>2</sub>)(C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>9</sub>O<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub> is used to accelerate

the bridge (cross-linkage) formation of the silicone resin, and obtain a dense film of the silicone resin composition.

In contrast, Kimura uses an **inorganic** zirconium compound such as zirconium oxide and zirconium oxynitrate, as shown in the Examples of Kimura, to adhere a photocatalyst such as TiO<sub>2</sub> on a carrier which is completely different in purpose than the present invention. Thus, Applicant strongly believes that Kimura fails to teach or suggest the use of a Zr containing **organic** compound for the purpose (i.e. *to accelerate the bridge (cross-linkage) formation of the silicone resin, and obtain a dense film of the resin composition*) disclosed in the present invention.

Applicant also notes that even if it can be argued that Kimura can be modified to use organic compounds, the selection of such compounds would not be for the same purpose as in the present invention since as noted above, Kimura only uses a zirconium compound to adhere a photocatalyst such as TiO<sub>2</sub> on a carrier and not to accelerate the bridge (cross-linkage) formation of the silicone resin.

Further, this deficiency in Kimura is not cured by the teachings of Koyanagi which has only been cited to confirm the particle size of the silica.


Hence, Applicant submits that a person skilled in the art would not be able to arrive at the present invention based on the teachings of Kimura or the combined teachings of Kimura and Koyanagi. Thus, for these reasons, withdrawal of the present rejections is respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, all the claims now pending in the present application are believed to be clearly patentable over the outstanding rejections. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of the claims in light of the above remarks is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

Dated: April 1, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By:  \_\_\_\_\_

Lee Cheng

Registration No.: 40,949

CHENG LAW GROUP PLLC

1100 17th Street, N.W.

Suite 503

Washington, DC 20036

(202) 530-1280

Attorneys for Applicant

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-4422 for any such fees; and applicant(s) hereby petition for any needed extension of time.